



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

some of the metopes of the Parthenon. For although he does say (p. 317) "Probably Amazon and Centaur were perpetuated and stereotyped in Greek art for purely artistic reasons, because they offered the artist an unlimited number of defined and graceful problems in pose and composition," nevertheless he seems to maintain that to the Athenian public of the fifth century B.C. the centauromachy of the Parthenon meant that Theseus and his men had "made it certain that Greece should not be the prey of the barbarous races of the North, stealers of boys and women, drunken and brutal, but should be able to grow and develop in peace." From this I dissent, not because I adhere to that other view which sees in the centauromachy a mythical prototype of the victories of Athenians over Persians, but because I think it susceptible of almost complete demonstration that this old folk-tale, in the representation of which on the Parthenon the Lapiths have no advantage over the Centaurs, could not have had for the artists who designed the metopes or for their public any patriotic significance at all. But this is a difficult question, which I hope to treat more at length in the near future.

FRANK BIGELOW TARBELL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Ovid and the Renaissance in Spain. By RUDOLPH SCHEVILL. "University of California Publications in Modern Philology," Vol. IV, No. 1, pp. 1-268, 1913.

The influence of Ovid on subsequent literature is a fascinating theme, still awaiting adequate treatment. After somewhat chequered fortunes in the later empire and early Middle Ages, Ovid's works acquired an enormous vogue at the end of the eleventh century, increased in popularity in the later Middle Ages and the Renaissance, in the sixteenth century well-nigh overshadowing even Virgil. After the middle of the seventeenth century their influence abated and is today at exceedingly low ebb.

Professor Schevill, who has already studied the indebtedness of Cervantes to Virgil (*Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* [1908]), examines in the present volume an important epoch in the posthumous career of Ovid. While his subject centers on the Spanish Renaissance, he treats summarily of Ovid's influence on mediaeval literature in Spain, with occasional consideration of Italy and France. He shows that in *El libro de buen amore* of Juan Ruiz, in the fourteenth century, Ovid is used directly and not at second hand merely, through the *Pamphilus de amore*. He then traces the development of the "Ovidian tale" and examines the Ovidian element in Spanish lyrics of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Cervantes knew Ovid well, though perhaps not directly, and Lope de Vega was familiar with the poet himself. Several appendices present texts on bibliographical material.

The imitation of Ovid is of a threefold nature. First, the whole scheme of the *Art of Love* is readapted in didactic works with a thoroughness and a seriousness that would have amazed its author; again, favorite tales of the *Metamorphoses* are retold or given a new setting, and lastly, special passages are imitated. Professor Schevill makes his points clearly, giving clever analyses and printing extended passages from Ovid and his emulators, so that the reader need rarely consult the original texts. Many of the coincidences are of a general and casual kind; for instance, certain specimens of the lover's vocabulary (pp. 58 ff.) might as appropriately be referred to Horace or Virgil as to Ovid. Of this fact the author is well aware. He errs on the safe side in giving too much rather than too little. With sure cases of Ovid's direct influence abundant, it is reasonable also to include passages which, if not deriving solely from Ovid, at least illustrate the Ovidian tradition.

The following details may deserve consideration.

The account of the attitude of the Christian church to the ancient literature (pp. 6 ff.) should, despite its necessary brevity, include some mention of the educational program of Cassiodorus.

The correct explanation of the omitted rubric (p. 9. vs. 7) in the 1493 edition of Isidore ([*P*oete not [*N*as]o, etc.) is given by Mustard, *Modern Language Notes*, XXIX, 64.

Isidore's purpose (p. 10) in citing Ovid as *quidam poetarum gentilium* was not to "omit the poet's name out of regard for the young monks to whom his words were directed." The Church Fathers often refer to an ancient writer as *quidam* without intending to disparage him or to conceal his identity—a practice perhaps reminiscent of St. Paul's *καί τινες τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν* (Acts 17:28) or the reference to the Psalmist in Heb. 2:6: *διεμαρτύρατο δὲ πού τις λέγων*. So St. Augustine alludes to Horace (*Confess.* iv. 6): "bene quidam dixit de amico suo, dimidium animae suae." The use of *quidam* in quotations deserves a special investigation.

Perhaps it is well not to discuss (pp. 11 f.) the unsatisfactory dissertation of S. Tafel, *Die Ueberlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids Carmina Amatoria* (1910), though mention should be made of that author's theory that Ovid's works were introduced into France during the Carolingian renaissance by way of Spain; at least Theodulf of Orléans, the first of the Carolingians to show an extensive knowledge of Ovid at first hand, was a Spaniard.

Even the briefest mention of Ovid's influence in the eleventh and twelfth centuries (p. 12) should not omit the name of Hildebert of Tours.

Roger Bacon, despite his censure of Ovid quoted on p. 13, could also say: "sicut egregius poeta dicit egregie" (*Communio naturalia*, I, pars 3, p. 202, ed. Steele [1911]). He accepted the genuineness of *De vetula* and with it the legend of Ovid's conversion *a vanitate ad veritatem* (*De viciis contractis in studio theologie*, p. 9, ed. Steele).

The Marqués de Santillana's line is indeed meaningless (p. 64) as edited—*Nasometo Forisante*—but it does not "clearly mean Ovid in his *Metamor-*

phoses." The poet says that among other ancients, as Virgil and Horace: "Vi al strolago Atalante | Que los cielos sustentó | Segund lo representó | Naso metaforisante." Atlas really, the poet would have it, was an astronomer whom Ovid, resorting to metaphor, represented as carrying the heavens on his shoulders.

The critical theory that rated Virgil's *Eclogues* as inferior to the *Aeneid* was not, as the writer seems to imply (p. 90), a development of the sixteenth century, but descends from Servius and Donatus, and indeed from the times of Virgil himself.

The discussion of Platonic versus Ovidian love (p. 96) might include a reference to J. A. Stewart's essay on "Platonism in English Poetry" in *English Literature and the Classics* (1912), p. 30.

The interesting treatment of the origin of the "Ovidian tale" in Italy (p. 101) suggests an answer to the old question whether Boccaccio knew the Greek romances; the evidence here presented goes far to prove that the elements common to Boccaccio and the Greek romances might have come to him solely from Ovid. Mention might have been made of the *Ameto*, which is saturated with Ovid.

The explanation given by Rodríguez de la Cámara of the very moral purpose of the *Heroides* (p. 115) is strikingly like that in a metrical life of Ovid written about the twelfth century; see Kerli, *Phaethonfabel* (1897), p. 6.

The statement (p. 144) that Dante "seems to express only admiration for Ovid because perhaps he had nothing but the *Metamorphoses* in mind and intentionally ignored the erotic works" might be reinforced by the fact that the purpose of Dante's only quotation from the *Carmina Amatoria* (*Rem.* 1 in *V.N.* 25. 97) is to illustrate a rhetorical detail.

Petrarch is truly "loud in condemnation of Ovid" (p. 144), but if I am right, he imitated *Amores* i. 2. in his *Trionfo d'amore*.

Read *Haenel* not *Haenal* (p. 240).

Professor Schevill thus lays the foundations for a structure which, let us hope, he will later build entire. The interesting history which he unfolds suggests the power for evil that a poet may exercise whose "page is naughty but whose life is pure." It shows also that the indecencies of a Boccaccio may reflect merely a literary tradition and not contemporary society.

E. K. RAND

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Die λύσις ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου. Ein exegetischer und kritischer Grundsatz Aristarchs und seine Neuanwendung auf Ilias und Odyssee. Inaugural Dissertation. Von HANS DACHS. Erlangen, 1913. Pp. 81.

This Erlangen dissertation, written in the spirit and under the guidance of Professor Roemer, sets for itself the determining of the use made by